agency would purchase technology for VCR/VCP, including technology for the manufacture of tape deck mecha nism. Taking into account the views expressed at the Government-Industry Meet, held, in May, 1985, Govern ment decided to dispense with the idea of centralised purchase. This was announced on 17-9-1985. Thereafter, on 25-10-1985, Government invited, through a Press Note, composite applications (i.e. industrial licence plus foreign collaboration) from interested entrepreneurs for the manufacture of VCR/VCPs, stating that only such units would be promoted as are prepared to commit sizeable investments for suitable vertical integration, with an accelerated phased manufacturing programme, and which have the requisite in-built capacity to keep pace with the changing technology. In response, 65 applications have been received by the prescribed last date viz., 24-1-1986, and are being scrutinised by an Inter-departmental Task Force.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) and (e) Do not arise.

Amendment of the Forest Conservation Act, 1980

1311. SHRI PYARELAL KHAN-DELWAL: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state;

(a) whether Government have issued any clarification/amendment on the 26th March. 1982 regarding ex-post facto application of the Forest Conservation Act 1980 to such development projects which were administra-tivelv sanctioned and started by State Governments prior to its enforcement on the 25th October, 1980;

(b) if so, the reasons for issuing such clarification or amendment without any specific provisions in the Forest (Conservation) Act and in contravention to ' the Act, without placing it before parliament; and

(c) how many development projects which were administratively sanctioned and started prior to the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 have been stopped or affected in Madhya Pradesh and elsewhere in the country by this clarification or amendment and how much money has been spent on such projects uptil now?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI Z. R. ANSARI): (a) The circular issued by Government of India on 26th March, 1982 was not in regard to ex-post-facto application of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

Action against Jail Officials at the behest of Charles Sobhraj

1312. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that whenever in the past complaints were made by the officials of Tihar Jail to the higher authorities about Charles Sobhraj who had escaped from the jail, they Were transferred at the behest of Sobhraj and in certain cases; the officials who complained against him were even dismissed from service;

(b) whether Government have made any inquiry into the cases where the jail officials on having complained against Sobhraj were transferred or dismissed from servicer and

(c) if so, what are the details thereof stating the action taken/proposed to be taken by Government to rectify the harm done to such officials?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): (a) No, Sir, it is not a fact that in tht past any officials of Tihar Jail wa? penalised or transferred at the behest Of Charles Sobhraj, who recently scaped from the jail.

(b) and (c) In view of the answer given in (a) above, question does not arise.